



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/887,816	06/25/2001	Keith Hoene	10007759-1	7631

7590 10/17/2005
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

CHEN, SHIN HON

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2131

DATE MAILED: 10/17/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/887,816

Applicant(s)

HOENE ET AL.

Examiner

Shin-Hon Chen

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 August 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 7, 11, 16, 19, 21 and 24-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 7, 11, 16, 19, 21 and 24-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 June 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-3, 7, 11, 16, 19, 21, and 24-27 have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. The term "tendency" in claims 19 and 21 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "tendency" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. The computers with tendency to be virus infected does not clearly set the scope of the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 1-3, 11, 19, 24, and 25 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chefalas et al. U.S. Pub. No. 20020116639 (hereinafter Chefalas) in view of Grosse U.S. Pat. No. 5205551 (hereinafter Grosse).

Art Unit: 2131

6. As per claim 1, and 11, Chefalas discloses a method of network computing: using a virus monitor of a server to identify a client computer that is infected with a virus or susceptible to a virus by verifying directly between the at least one client computer and the virus monitor of the server (Chefalas: [0012]: the VSN and VSC communicate directly), that the at least one client computer comprises at least one of: automatically isolating the virus-infected client computers and virus-susceptible client computers from the server and from a computing network connected to the server (Chefalas: [0012]). Chefalas further discloses wherein the using and isolating steps further comprise: detecting client computers that are infected with virus; and terminating a client-server connection for client computers that are infected with virus. Chefalas does not explicitly disclose detecting client computer that do not maintains an enabled virus protector and isolate client computer that have a disabled virus protector. However, Grosse discloses detecting client computers that do not have proper security configurations and detecting client computers that are not enabled for virus protection during an attempted client server connection and preventing connection for those misconfigured client computers, and take appropriate actions to correct the client information (Grosse: column 3 lines 6-34). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to detect client computers that do not have ability to protect themselves from virus attacks and quarantine them from other network devices. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Grosse within the system of Chefalas because it prevents virus from spreading across entire network.

Art Unit: 2131

7. As per claim 2, Chefalas discloses the method of claim 1. Chefalas further discloses wherein the using step further comprises: scanning the client computer with a virus monitor of at least one of the server and the client computer (Chefalas: [0012]).

8. As per claim 3 and 14, Chefalas as modified discloses the method of claims 1 and 11 respectively. Chefalas as modified further discloses wherein the isolating step further comprises: tracking a client identifier of the virus-infected and virus-susceptible client computers (Chefalas: figures 4a and 4b and [0044]); and preventing a client-server connection and network communications between the virus-infected client computers and virus-susceptible client computer and the computing network (Chefalas: [0012]).

9. As per claim 19, 24, and 25, claims 19, 24, and 25 encompass the same scope of invention as that of claim 3. Therefore, claims 19, 24, and 25 are rejected with the same reason as claims 3 above and claim 7 below.

10. Claims 7, 16, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chefalas in view of Stiles U.S. Pat. No. 6330608 (hereinafter Stiles) and further in view of Grosse and further in view of Arnold et al. U.S. Pat. No. 5440723 (hereinafter Arnold) and further in view of Hodges et al. U.S. Pat. No. 6269456 (hereinafter Hodges).

11. As per claim 7, Chefalas discloses a method of maintaining a virus-controlled network computing system comprising: booting at least one client computer to establish a client-server

Art Unit: 2131

connection with a server for limited access and to perform a scan by the at least one client computer of the at least one client computer for a virus (Chefalas: [0012]); reporting the results of the virus scan from the at least one client computer to the server (Chefalas: [0012]). Chefalas does not explicitly disclose selectively permitting the client computer authorized access to the server through the client-server connection when the virus scan report detects no viruses and denying the client computer access to the server when a virus is detected or no valid virus report is provided by the client computer. However, Stiles discloses checking whether the module request access has virus infection and a set of criteria before it is being permitted to connect with the system (Stiles: column 2 line 56 – column 3 line 40). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Stiles within the system of Chefalas because it increases the security of the network system by making sure the client is not virus infected before the connection is established.

Chefalas as modified does not explicitly disclose including the server establishing the client-server connection only when the at least one client computer includes a virus protection program in an enabled mode. However, Grosse discloses detecting client computers that do not have proper security configurations and detecting client computers that are not enabled for virus protection during an attempted client server connection and preventing connection for those misconfigured client computers, and take appropriate actions to correct the client information (Grosse: column 3 lines 6-34). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to allow the server to check whether the VSN residing on client computer is properly configured and disallow connection between the client and the network if the client is misconfigured because virus protection schemes can be combined to achieve greater security. Therefore, it

Art Unit: 2131

would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Grosse within the combination of Chefalas-Stiles because it prevents virus from spreading across entire network by checking whether the client computer has the ability to protect itself from virus.

Chefalas as modified does not explicitly disclose wherein the terminating step further comprises: querying the client periodically to determine if the virus protector of the client computer remains enabled. However, Arnold discloses periodically monitor a data processing system for presence of virus (Arnold: column 2 line 45 – column 3 line 12). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to periodically monitor the client computer and check if the client is virus-infected. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Arnold within the combination of Chefalas-Stiles-Grosse because it increases the security of the network system by ensuring that the virus to be detected as soon as possible if it occurred.

Chefalas as modified does not explicitly disclose the method further comprising: terminating the client-server connection if the virus definitions of the virus protector of the client computer have not been updated within a specified date criteria of the server. However, Hodges discloses a server checks whether the antivirus software on a client computer is up-to-date and updates antivirus software on client computer if the version is old (Hodges: column 4 line 53 – column 5 line 48). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to terminate client-server connection if the antivirus software on client computer is not up-to-date. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in

Art Unit: 2131

the art at the time of applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Hodges within the combination of Chefalas-Stiles-Grosse-Arnold because new viruses are being developed each day and it is necessary for a computer system with newest virus definition to detect new virus in order to ensure the security of network.

12. As per claim 16, claim 16 encompasses the same scope of the invention as that of the claim 7. Therefore, claim 16 is rejected for the same reason as the claim 7.

13. As per claim 18, Chefalas as modified discloses the system of claim 16. Chefalas as modified further discloses wherein the virus monitor of the server further comprises: a virus protector for scanning the client computer and files written by the client computer (Chefalas: [0012]).

14. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chefalas in view of Grosse and further in view of Hodges.

15. As per claim 21, Chefalas discloses a virus protector; a quarantine monitor configured for preventing network communications to a server of a network originating from each client computer that is virus-infected or that is virus susceptible and configured for tracking an identity of each virus-infected client computer and each virus susceptible client computers (Chefalas: [0012]). Chefalas does not explicitly disclose detecting if client computer is virus-infected or

Art Unit: 2131

virus susceptible by having at least one of a disabled virus protector and a virus definition set that is not up-to-date. However, Grosse disclose detecting if security setting of a client computer is misconfigured (Grosse: column 3 lines 6-34). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to detect client computers that do not have ability to protect themselves from virus attacks and quarantine them from other network devices. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Grosse within the system of Chefalas because it prevents virus from spreading across entire network. Chefalas as modified does not explicitly disclose the server checks whether client's virus protector is up-to-date. However, Hodges discloses that limitation (Hodges: column 4 line 53 – column 5 line 48). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to terminate client-server connection if the antivirus software on client computer is not up-to-date. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Hodges within the combination of Chefalas-Grosse because new viruses are being developed each day and it is necessary for a computer system with newest virus definition to detect new virus in order to ensure the security of network.

Response to Arguments

16. Regarding applicant's remarks, applicant argues that the prior arts of record does not explicitly disclose directly verifying between the client computer and the server. However, Chefalas discloses the VSN and VSC communicate directly to achieve virus protection on client

Art Unit: 2131

computer while Grosse discloses determining whether the virus protection scheme has been properly configured at client computer. Therefore, the combination of Chefalas and Grosse discloses determining whether the virus protection software residing at client computer is configured properly and it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to combine the two references because they are analogous in the art and combining the two references together would achieve greater virus protection capabilities. Furthermore, the term “directly verifying” can be given a broad interpretation such that any communication between the server and the client would be interpreted as “direct communication”.

17. Also regarding claim 1, applicant argues that Grosse reference does not disclose terminating or preventing a client-server connection based on verifying the status of a virus protector. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

18. Furthermore, applicant argues that the reference does not disclose automatically terminating a client-server connection. However, Chefalas discloses sever the communication between the client and the network immediately after notification from VSN. Therefore, the term automatically does not differentiate the claimed invention and prior art because it does not define what automatically is based on.

Art Unit: 2131

19. Regarding Hodges reference, applicant argues that the reference teaches away from the invention. However, Hodges reference discloses server can check whether the virus protector residing in client computer is up-to-date and perform necessary steps. Hodges reference is relied upon in disclosing the server can check the status of the virus protector, not the actions performed by server after the determination.

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shin-Hon Chen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3789. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:30am to 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Shin-Hon Chen
Examiner
Art Unit 2131

SC


AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100